OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CANADIANS, 1971

by

E. Hugh Lautard, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
University of New Brunswick

....a continuing program of education in human rights.

1982

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CANADIANS, 1971

A Report Submitted to the

New Brunswick Human Rights Commission

by

E. Hugh Lautard, Ph.D.

Department of Sociology

University of New Brunswick

Fredericton, N.B.

Canada

1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of those who assisted me with this study. I thank Michael O'Brien, Director of the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission, for encouraging and supporting the project. Michael Whalen of Census Operations Division, Statistics Canada, was particularly helpful in providing the required custom tabulations of previously unreleased census data. The study, of course, could not have been carried out without the aid of the University of New Brunswick personnel and facilities. Thanks are due Charles Thornton, Office of Research Administration; Isobel Shewan and her staff for keypunching; and especially Nancy Burham for programming; and Thomas Henderson, my research assistant on the project, for computing and tabulating. Finally, I thank Thelma Clarke for typing this report.

H. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. DATA AND METHODS 11

3. OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CANADIANS 20

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 35

REFERENCES 37

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Occupational Distribution of Selected Ethnic Groups (Males): Canada, 1961	4
2.	Occupational Class Distribution of Selected Ethnic Groups (Both Sexes) Canada, 1951	6
3.	Occupational Class Distribution of Indians and Total Labor Force, By Sex: Canada, 1961	8
4.	Experienced Native and Non-Native Male Labor Force: Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1971	13
5.	Experienced Native and Non-Native Female Labor Force: Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1971	14
6.	Occupational Distribution of Indians and Total Labor Force, By Sex: Canada, 1971	21
7.	Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation of Native from Non-Native Males: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971	23
8.	Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation of Native from Non-Native Females: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971	26
9.	Occupational Class Distribution of Natives and Non-Natives, By Sex: Canada, 1971	28
10.	Standardized Indexes of Occupational Inequality Between Native and Non-Native Males: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971	30

Table Page

11. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Inequality Between Native and Non-Native Females: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971 31

12. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation and Inequality Between Indians and Non-Native Canadians, By Sex: 1951-1971 36

INTRODUCTION

Regardless of whether ethnic relations in Canada are conceived as producing a cultural mosaic or a "melting pot," Native Indians and Inuit are unequivocally at the greatest disadvantage. In his pioneer study of ethnic stratification in Canada, Porter (1965) found the Natives, as a group, alone at the very bottom of the Vertical Mosaic. Similarly, even the most recent and serious challenge to Porter's ethnic-mosaic thesis notes "the extraordinary persistence of distorted occupational distributions of the native population," whose circumstances are acknowledged as "the most deprived . . . in [the] country" (Darroch, 1979:9, 11). Previous studies, however, raise more questions than they answer concerning ethnic stratification, particularly with regard to Native/non-Native differentials. The largest gap in our knowledge arises from the failure to pay the same attention to women as to men. Porter (1965), for example, in his discussion of Ethnic Affiliation and Occupational Class, devotes one table and two paragraphs to females. In his analysis of ethnic segregation, Darroch (1979) ignores women, despite using 1971 data for men and women combined (without mentioning the resulting imcomparability with the male-only figures

for previous census years).

Although it is possible to make a useful distinction between Indians living on reserves and those living off reserves (cf. Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1980:133-147), this implies the prior and equally important distinction between "status" Indians, registered as members of Indian Bands recognized under the Indian Act, who may reside either on or off their reserves, and 'nonstatus' Indians, who have no recognition under the Indian Act and therefore no reserve land. As well, there is the basic distinction to be made between Indians on the one hand and the Inuit, or Eskimos, on the other. Finally, there is the question of regional variation in Native/non-Native differentials, which remain unexamined below the national level. Although the importance of regional variation and of the on/off-reserve residence, the status/nonstatus-Indian and the Indian-Inuit distinctions are recognized by the Task Force on Labour Market Development established in July 1980, its Report reflects the absence of comprehensive studies with comparisons based on these distinctions (Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, 1981:95-98).

Inadequate, too, is the level of distinctions made in the <u>occupational</u> dimension of the data usually analyzed in ethnic-stratification research. Chief among these is the failure to examine differences at the most detailed level available. For example, Porter used a crude classification, consisting of six broad occupational groups. This scheme,

of course, permitted him to compare the distributions of ethnic groups in a manageable fashion. Nor was Porter's scheme entirely inappropriate for 1931, the earliest year he studied, when over one-third (36 percent) of the total male labor force was in agriculture. By 1961, however, the shift out of agriculture (left with 12 percent) resulted in over half (58 percent) of the male labor force being in the residual, "All others" category (Table 1). Such crude classification masks many crucial differences and puts into question the apparent congruency between the distribution of the French and that of the total labor force.

Yet another kind of distinction inadequate in previous studies of occupational differentials among ethnic groups is that between mere difference on the one hand and <u>inequality</u> on the other. Admittedly, much inequality may be inferred from Table 1. In 1961, Indians were underrepresented in professional and financial occupations, where the British and particularly the Jews were overrepresented. Conversely, Indians were overrepresented in primary and unskilled work, where the British and especially the Jews were underrepresented. The relative rank of other occupational categories, however, remains ambiguous, as do the implications of disproportionate representation therein. For example, is the overrepresentation of Indians in agriculture an advantage or a disadvantage for the Natives? The answer would depend, among other things, on the relative proportions of Indians and non-Natives owning farms as opposed to being employed on

Table 1. Occupational Distribution of Selected Ethnic Groups (Males): Canada, 1961.

Occupational Category	Total Labor Force	Ethnic Group			
		British	French	Jewish	Indian
Professional and financial	9%	11%	7%	16%	1%
Clerical	7	8	7	7	1
Personal service	4	3	4	2	6
Primary and unskilled	10	8	13	1	45
Agriculture	12	11	11	1	19
All others	58	59	59	74	29
Total[a]	100%	100%	101%	101%	101%

[a]May not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Based on Porter (1965:564).

others' farms. For ethnic stratification based on occupational inequality can be revealed only by ordinal data, which provide a ranking of all occupations, usually in terms of prestige, as indicated by the average levels of education and income associated with each job. Blishen (1958, 1967) and Blishen and McRoberts (1976) have prepared and revised such a socioeconomic ranking of the detailed occupations used in the 1951, 1961 and 1971 Censuses.

Although Porter (1965) examined some of Blishen's (1958) data on ethnic inequality in 1951 (the only year for which the ranking was then available), the data failed to distinguish males and females. Nevertheless, these rank distributions, some of which are reproduced in Table 2, confirm the extreme disadvantage of Native Canadians, 72 percent of whom are in the lowest occupational rank. The highest corresponding figure among the eleven other ethnic categories included in Blishen's (1958) data is 34 percent, for Asians (not shown in Table 2). The proportion of Asians (28 percent) in the upper four classes combined, however, exceeded that of the total labor force (25 percent). Table 2 also confirms the relatively high overall rank of Jewish Canadians, but the breadth of the classes can suggest only a slight advantage for the British and a slight disadvantage for the French.

Although Darroch (1979) analyzed ranked occupational data for 1961 prepared by Blishen (1970), the data were for birthplace and immigration, rather than for ethnicity, thus providing no updating of information on the relative

Table 2. Occupational Class Distribution of Selected Ethnic Groups (Both Sexes): Canada, 1951

Occupational Class	Total Labor Force	British	French	Jewish	Indian & Inuit
1 (Highest)	0.9%	1.3%	0.6%	2.9%	0.0%
2	10.7	11.8	9.5	35.7	1.3
3	6.3	8.3	4.1	10.1	0.9
4	7.0	9.5	5.4	9.5	1.2
5	34.2	36.2	30.6	18.0	12.0
6	19.6	17.0	24.5	20.0	12.8
7 (Lowest)	21.3	16.9	25.3	3.8	71.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Blishen (1958:531).

occupational rank of Native Canadians. These data for 1961 are shown for the first time in Table 3, which presents occupational distributions for Indians and the total labor force by sex. Although the extreme disadvantage of Indians clearly persisted until 1961, and characterized the relative ranks of both sexes, a question arises with respect to the disadvantage of Indian men (vis-à-vis all males), as compared with the disadvantage cf Indian women (vis-à-vis all females). Proportionally there are slightly more Indian men in the lower two classes combined (94 percent) than Indian women (87 percent). The same relation holds, however, between all males and all females, for whom the equivalent figures are 63 and 61 percent, respectively.

This kind of problem in such analyses calls for the application of a summary measure, or <u>index</u>, of the differentials under consideration. Measurement of this type, however, is rare in studies of ethnic stratification. Indeed, Darroch's challenge to Porter is based largely on indexing Porter's own data. Applying a summary measure of inequality to the rankings in Table 3 yields a value of -51 as the index of the status of Indian men and -44 for Indian women (relative to all males and all females, respectively). The minus signs reflect the Indian disadvantage, while the larger (absolute) size of the index for males indicates that in these data the Native/non-Native differential is more pronounced among men than women.

Most summary indexes, however, are affected by the

Table 3. Occupational Class Distribution of Indians and Total Labor Force, By Sex: Canada, 1961.

Occupational Class[a]	Male		Female	
	Total Labor Force	Indian	Total Labor Force	Indian
1 (Highest)	4%	0%	7%	2%
2	4	0	2	0
3	9	1	12	3
4	20	4	28	8
5	32	17	25	27
6 (Lowest)	31	77	26	60
Total[b]	100%	99%	100%	100%

[a]Blishen (1967).

[b]May not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1964: Table 21).

grouping of the data to which they are applied. Although, as noted above, Darroch (1979) did not analyze ethnic inequality he did apply a summary measure of segregation (i.e., the "mere difference" between unranked occupational distributions, referred to on page 3). As Darroch himself points out, the value of this "index of dissimilarity" increases with the number of categories to which it is applied: "other things equal, dissimilarity indexes based on a larger number and more refined categories tend to be greater than indexes based on more gross categories" (1979: 12; his emphasis). This property of the dissimilarity index, of course, puts Darroch's own findings in doubt. For example, with Porter's broad occupational classification, he calculates the level of Native/non-Native segregation among males in 1961 at 43. The corresponding value computed with the original, detailed occupational distributions is 56; the equivalent index for females is 48.

Another factor affecting such indexes is the uneven occupational distribution of the total labor force (cf. Tables 1, 2 and 3). To remove the "structural effects" of overall occupational composition, which usually serve to reduce measured segregation and inequality, the data are "standardized on occupation." This is done by assigning an equal number of workers to each occupational category (or rank) according to the original within-category Native/non-Native distribution (e.g., Gibbs, 1965:163-164). The standardized indexes of Native/non-Native segregation for

1961 are 65 among males and 73 among females, indicating that in 1961 overall occupational composition was masking a substantial amount of the segregation measured among both males and females. The corresponding figures for 1951 are 71 among males, 80 among females. Using detailed and standardized data to index the relative disadvantages of Indians in 1961 yields values of -65 for men and -68 for women. The corresponding indexes for 1951 are -81 and -86, respectively.[1] Thus, occupational segregation and inequality between Native and non-Native Canadians apparently declined over the 1950s, though both remained very high. (The formulas and interpretations of the indexes of segregation and inequality are given in the next section.)

Summary

An adequate assessment of the relative occupational status of Native Canadians, then, would require indexing of both segregation and inequality at the most detailed level available, distinguishing Inuit from Indians, status from non-status Indians and on/off-reserve residence. The analysis should focus on each sex separately and, wherever possible, the investigation should be conducted at the provincial level, in order to determine the regional variation in the differentials observed at the national level. The following section describes the data and methods used for such a study of Native/non-Native occupational differentials in Canada as of 1971.

---

[1]Indexes based on detailed data for 1951 and 1961 result from my collaboration in the study of ethnic stratification with Dr. Donald Loree.

2

DATA AND METHODS

The previous section documents the extreme segregation of Native Canadians into the lowest occupational levels as of 1951 and 1961, but notes the absence of separate evidence for the Inuit, for status and nonstatus Indians and by on/off-reserve residence. All these data are collected by the Census, but not published with occupational breakdowns. Custom tabulations of unpublished Census data, however, are available at cost for 1971. Accordingly, detailed occupational distributions as of 1971 were acquired for Natives and non-Natives. These cross-classifications included breakdowns by sex and province, and distinguished between Inuit and Indian, status and nonstatus Indians, and on- and off-reserve residence for status Indians. Given the 1971 Census definition of ethnicity as paternal ancestry in a single cultural group and the inherently mixed character of Métis ethnicity, "Métis" is effectively unrecognized in 1971 Census ethnic data. Persons declaring themselves as either "Métis" or "half-breed" <u>and</u> living on reserves were included by Statistics Canada with "non-band"--i.e., nonstatus--Indians (Statistics Canada, 1976: 18-19). Métis, therefore, cannot be distinguished in this analysis.

Inasmuch as occupational segregation and inequality can be measured only for those who have an occupation, the data to be analyzed are restricted to persons 15 years of age and over who stated an occupation in which they were either employed or looking for work, excluding those who had last worked prior to January 1, 1970 or who had never worked. The numbers of such persons in each category are shown in Tables 4 (males) and 5 (females). Newfoundland is omitted because in that province there are no Indian bands recognized under the Indian Act. The few status Indians enumerated in Newfoundland by the 1971 Census (150 men and women) presumably were from another province. Prince Edward Island is excluded from this study because the numbers of Indians with an occupation (35 males, 15 females) are too small for analysis. Although lands for the use of status Indians in the Yukon and Northwest Territories are set aside under the Territorial Lands Act, there are no reserves in the Territories within the meaning of the Indian Act (Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1972:291, 295). The on/off-reserve distinction, therefore, is not applicable in the Yukon or Northwest Territories. (It may be noted that not all totals or subtotals in Tables 4 and 5 equal the sum of the individual figures. This results from Census policy of random rounding of final digits up or down to zero or 5.)

In the country as a whole, status Indians comprise about three-quarters of all Indians counted by the Census.

Table 4. Experienced Native and Non-Native Male Labor Force: Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1971.

Province	Non-Native	Indian					Inuit
		Total Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
			Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
Canada	5,211,625	33,945	25,035	13,215	11,045	8,910	2,155
Nfld.	97,980	120	35	NA	NA	85	50
P.E.I.	26,270	35	30	25	--[a]	--[a]	--[a]
N.S.	182,710	445	355	250	105	95	--[a]
N.B.	140,615	410	330	230	100	75	--[a]
Que.	1,317,535	4,300	2,775	1,290	1,480	1,520	540
Ont.	1,996,730	9,070	7,225	3,305	3,925	1,840	245
Man.	246,140	4,155	3,065	1,890	1,175	1,085	20
Sask.	230,835	3,410	2,530	1,565	965	885	15
Alta.	414,250	4,330	2,520	1,545	990	1,810	10
B.C.	549,640	6,685	5,420	3,115	2,305	1,260	65
Yukon	4,490	315	250	NA	NA	60	--[a]
N.W.T.	4,430	675	480	NA	NA	190	1,200

[a]Five or less.

Source: Special tabulation of 1971 Census data.

Table 5. Experienced Native and Non-Native Female Labor Force: Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1971.

Province	Non-Native	Indian					Inuit
		Total Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
			Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
Canada	2,628,380	12,665	8,955	3,015	5,660	3,715	900
Nfld.	35,295	30	15	NA	NA	15	20
P.E.I.	12,590	15	10	—[a]	—[a]	—[a]	—[a]
N.S.	81,305	195	155	60	95	45	10
N.B.	63,570	115	90	60	35	25	—[a]
Que.	618,190	1,780	990	250	745	790	240
Ont.	1,085,755	3,795	2,815	775	2,035	985	95
Man.	130,610	1,285	915	400	520	365	10
Sask.	107,450	1,135	840	300	540	295	10
Alta.	211,735	1,635	1,000	500	500	635	15
B.C.	272,765	2,320	1,870	670	1,190	450	25
Yukon	2,090	100	75	NA	NA	25	—[a]
N.W.T.	2,055	270	190	NA	NA	80	450

[a]Five or less.

Source: Special tabulation of 1971 Census data.

The proportion is slightly lower for females (71 percent) than for males (74 percent), perhaps reflecting loss of status by Indian women marrying men without Indian status (Canada. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1980:94). Provincially the status/nonstatus ratio varies for both sexes, but status Indians are everywhere in the majority, reflecting in part perhaps that on Indian reserves and in the North the 1971 Census collected the information on ethnicity and occupation by complete enumeration rather than by sampling.

On average, status Indian male workers are only slightly more likely to reside on their reserves (53 percent) than off, except in Quebec and Ontario, perhaps reflecting relatively greater off-reserve employment opportunities in those provinces. In contrast, barely one-third (34 percent) of Canada's female status Indian workers live on reserves. As for males, however, the lowest on-reserve percentages are in Quebec (25 percent) and Ontario (28 percent), but the range is greater: up to 50 percent in Alberta and 66 percent in New Brunswick. Most off-reserve residence involves migration of young adults to obtain employment in urban areas, although this would not account completely for the much lower on-reserve proportions for women, the explanation for which is beyond the scope of this study.

Even at the national level, there will be very few Inuit in our analysis (2155 males, 900 females). About half of these are in the Northwest Territories, and a quarter in

Quebec, the only province in which Inuit are numerous enough for analysis. Although in total Indians are much more numerous than the Inuit, the status-nonstatus and on/off-reserve distinctions have produced some very small groups, particularly among the women and in the Maritimes and Territories. The low numbers of Natives in Tables 4 and 5 reflect not only the relatively small Native populations (about 300,000 Indians and 18,000 Inuit), but also the comparatively lower Native labor force participation rates. The roughly 36,000 Indian and Inuit males in Table 4, for example, represent only 42 percent of all Native males 15 years of age and over; the equivalent figure for non-Native men is 70 percent. Among women the corresponding rates are 16 percent for Natives, 35 percent for non-Natives.

For purposes of the occupational analysis of the present study, however, the effect of the low numbers of Native workers in the various categories distinguished is mitigated by three things. First, there is considerable clustering of Natives in a relatively small number of occupations. For example, over three-quarters (77 percent) of Indian males are concentrated in seventy occupations, each containing more than a hundred Indian men. Similarly, 74 percent of Indian women workers are found in thirty occupations, each containing more than a hundred female Indian workers. Second, as noted above, much of this information on occupation and ethnicity was collected by complete enumeration rather than by sampling, thus eliminating much error. Third,

the relatively small number of Natives is offset by the nature of the indexes to be used in this analysis, in that their calculation is based jointly on the distributions of Natives and non-Natives. Nevertheless, in some Native categories and in some provinces the numbers are too small to yield dependable results. Since the calculation of the segregation index involves percentage differences, segregation will not be reported where the number of Natives does not exceed both 100 and the number of occupations in that particular analysis. Because the inequality index is based on cumulative proportions and therefore is not as dependent on the number in individual cells, inequality will be reported for all groups numbering over 100. Should these criteria seem overly stringent, it must be appreciated that the random rounding procedure, mentioned above, "can totally distort the actual shape and nature of a distribution with an overall low 'n'" (Lanphier, 1980:58).

The segregation of each category of Natives from non-Natives is measured with the index used by Darroch (1979:8), the commonly used index of dissimilarity (D), for which the formula is

$$D = 100(\Sigma|X_i - Y_i|)/2$$

where Y_i is the proportion of non-Natives in each occupation, X_i is the proportion of Natives in each occupation, and the summation is of the absolute differences (i.e., disregarding minus signs). A calculated value of this index of segregation

represents the percentage of Natives (or non-Natives) who would have to change occupations in order to have no occupational segregation (i.e., for both Natives and non-Natives to have identical occupational distributions).

The occupational distributions are then ordered according to the Blishen socioeconomic ranking (Blishen and McRoberts, 1976) and Native/non-Native inequality measured by the index of inequality used by Darroch (1979:13-14), the index of net difference (ND), the formula for which is

$$ND = 100\left(\sum_{i=2}^{n} X_{i-1}Y_i - \sum_{i=2}^{n} X_i Y_{i-1}\right)$$

where Y_i is the cumulated proportion of non-Natives at each occupational rank, X_i is the cumulated proportion of Natives at each occupational rank, and the summations are over the specified occupational ranks. ND varies from -100 through zero to +100. Negative values indicate the extent to which the probability of a Native being in a lower occupational rank than a non-Native exceeds the opposite probability. Darroch would interpret a value of -30 as indicating a "decisive" disadvantage, while Duncan (1952:268) has taken -20 as measuring "very" disproportionate situations. Even the latter interpretation might be overly conservative in this study, since the Blishen ranks are based on the average levels of education and income and therefore tend to overestimate the occupational rank of Natives, most of whom have much less education and earn much less than the average worker.

Prior to computing the segregation and inequality indexes the data are standardized on occupation, to eliminate the influence of overall occupational composition on the differentials measured (see pages 9-10, above).

Summary

The central feature of this study, then, is the application of summary indexes of segregation and inequality to hitherto unavailable occupational data on Native peoples in Canada. The following section presents the results of this analysis, which distinguishes Inuit from Indians and on/off-reserve residence for status Indians, who in turn are distinguished from nonstatus Indians. As far as possible, the investigation is conducted at the provincial level and carried out for each sex separately.

3

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CANADIANS, 1971

Before examining the results of the analysis of occupational segregation and inequality between Native and non-Native Canadians in 1971, it is useful to consider the general occupational differences between at least the Indian and total populations. Because the 1971 Census used a new occupational classification, the data presented in Table 6 are not comparable with those in Table 1, except perhaps for agriculture, where greater similarity between the Indian and total distributions is indicated. Otherwise, significant differences remain. Proportionally, among males there are one-third as many Indians as all workers in management and administration, and fewer in professional and technical occupations, half as many in clerical jobs and roughly a quarter as many in sales. In service and transport Indian representation matches that of the total labor force. Compared with all men, there are eight times as many Indian men in fishing, hunting and trapping, and seven times as many in other nonagricultural primary pursuits. Production processes account for a larger share of Indians than of the total labor force.

Table 6. Occupational Distribution of Indians and Total Labor Force, By Sex: Canada, 1971

Occupational Group	Male		Female	
	Total Labor Force	Indian	Total Labor Force	Indian
Management and administration	6%	2%	2%	2%
Professional and technical	11	7	20	17
Clerical	8	4	36	23
Sales	11	3	9	5
Service	10	10	17	34
Transportation	6	6	--[a]	1
Farming	8	10	4	4
Fishing, hunting and trapping	0.5	4	--[a]	--[a]
Other Primary	2	14	--[a]	1
Production processes	35	40	11	13
Total[b]	98%	100%	99%	100%

[a]Less than 0.5 percent.

[b]May not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada (1975: Table 4).

The distribution of Indian women is similar to all women in management and administration, but Indian females are underrepresented in the professional and technical, the clerical and the sales categories. At the same time, there are proportionally twice as many Indian women in service jobs and more in transport and nonagricultural primary occupations and in production processes. When examining these figures and the indexed Native/non-Native differentials, it should be borne in mind that occupational data for Natives include many more times as many unemployed persons as do data for non-Natives: estimates of Indian unemployment range from over twice the national level for all Indians to thirteen times that of the total population among middle-aged, off-reserve residents (Canada. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1980:59; McGahan, 1982:126).

Native/Non-Native Occupational Segregation

The occupational segregation of Indian men indicated in Table 6 is confirmed by the persistently high indexes for Indian men in Table 7, where the values represent the percentages of Natives (or non-Natives) who would have to change jobs to have identical occupational distributions. There is evidence in Table 7, moreover, of considerable variation by status, residence and province. Although at the national level nonstatus Indian males are slightly less segregated from non-Natives (58) than are status Indian males (62), the opposite relation holds provincially. The indexes for status Indian men range from

Table 7. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation[a] of Native from Non-Native Males: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971.

Province	Indian					Inuit	Number of Occupations
	Total Native Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian		
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve			
Canada	54	62	83[b]	74[b]	58	87	498
N.S.	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	474
N.B.	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	464
Que.	59	70	83	76	71	94	498
Ont.	61	66	79	64	70	--[c]	498
Man.	74	79	86	83	83	--[c]	483
Sask.	77	81	89	84	87	--[c]	455
Alta.	76	81	87	86	83	--[c]	495
B.C.	67	71	82	73	81	--[c]	489
Yukon	82	89	NA	NA	--[c]	--[c]	218
N.W.T.	79	85	NA	NA	--[c]	80	231

[a]The indexes represent the percentage of Natives or non-Natives which would have to change jobs to have identical occupational distributions of Natives and non-Natives. Standardization eliminates the effect of the overall occupational structure on the segregation measured.

[b]Weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable.

[c]Number too small for analysis.

a low of 66 in Ontario to 81 in Saskatchewan and Alberta, while those for nonstatus Indian males vary from 70 in Ontario to 87 in Saskatchewan. As one would expect, however, given the greater off-reserve employment opportunities, status Indian men living off their reserves are less segregated occupationally from non-Native males than those residing on reserves. There is, however, considerably more provincial variation in off-reserve segregation, which ranges from a low of 64 in Ontario to a high of 86 in Alberta, for the national average of 74. Occupational segregation of Indian men on reserves ranges from a low of 79 in Ontario to a high of 89 in Saskatchewan, for the national average of 83. Evidently, residential and occupational segregation go hand in hand. Among all Indian males segregation varies from 59 in Quebec to 82 in the Yukon; the national figure is 54. Inuit men show a higher level of segregation nationally (87) and in the Northwest Territories (80), the jurisdiction with the largest Inuit population. The corresponding figure for Quebec, the only province in which the Inuit are numerous enough for analysis, is 94, the highest value in Table 7. Provincially, there is among Indian men a consistent pattern, in which the occupational segregation is lower in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia than in either the Prairie Provinces or, where measurable, the Territories. Among nonstatus Indians in British Columbia, however, the degree of segregation (81) is closer to that in the other Western provinces, with an average of 84, than either Quebec (71) or Ontario (70).

A similar, though less consistent, provincial pattern emerges in the occupational segregation of Native women (Table 8), which is generally higher but less variable than that observed among men. Like those for men, off-reserve segregation indexes for women are consistently lower than the corresponding on-reserve figures; the national averages are 85 and 90, respectively. The on-reserve indexes for Manitoba and British Columbia are both 91, the highest value in either Table 7 or Table 8. Like Indian men provincially, status Indian women are less segregated from non-Native females (71) than are nonstatus Indian women (74); the only exception is Quebec. The segregation of Inuit women is three points greater than that of Inuit men for both the country as a whole (90) and in the Northwest Territories (83), the only sub-national calculation possible.

Differences in the number and definition of Census occupations between 1961 and 1971 notwithstanding, the occupational segregation of Native Canadians probably declined over the decade. The values of 54 and 62 for all Indian men and women, respectively, are lower than the corresponding figures (65 and 73) reported for 1961 in the Introduction (p. 10, above). The status, residence and provincial distinctions made in the present study, however, have revealed instances of occupational segregation approaching the maximum measurable.

Table 8. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation[a] of Native from Non-Native Females: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971.

Province	Indian					Inuit	Number of Occupations
	Total Native Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian		
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve			
Canada	62	71	90[b]	84[b]	74	90	464
N.S.	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	315
N.B.	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	300
Que.	80	87	--[c]	89	86	--[c]	452
Ont.	74	77	90	79	85	--[c]	457
Man.	84	85	91	90	90	--[c]	359
Sask.	84	87	--[c]	88	--[c]	--[c]	301
Alta.	83	87	90	89	89	--[c]	374
B.C.	80	84	91	85	90	--[c]	410
Yukon	--[c]	--[c]	NA	NA	--[c]	--[c]	95
N.W.T.	80	83	NA	NA	--[c]	83	101

[a]The indexes represent the percentage of Natives or non-Natives which would have to change jobs to have identical occupational distributions of Natives and non-Natives. Standardization eliminates the effect of the overall occupational structure on the segregation measured.

[b]Weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable.

[c]Number too small for analysis.

Native/Non-Native Occupational Inequality

The degree of disadvantage associated with the segregation considered above is revealed when the data are ranked and indexed for Native/non-Native occupational inequality. Again, however, before examining the indexes calculated with the detailed occupational rankings, it is useful to consider the broad, occupational-class distributions of Natives and non-Natives in the country as a whole as of 1971. These distributions, presented in Table 9, suggest that the occupational disadvantages to Indians may have decreased since 1961 (cf. Table 3, above). The proportions of both status and nonstatus Indians of both sexes found in the two bottom classes in 1971 (Table 9) are lower than in 1961 (Table 3). However, the proportion of non-Natives in the bottom two classes had decreased also. Again, one must turn to indexes to summarize the complex relations prevailing in these data.

Although Table 10 does indicate less occupational disadvantage for Indian men (-45) compared with their situation in 1961 (-65), it should be remembered that any (absolute) value of 20, and certainly of 30, or more indicates a great degree of inequality. The relative disadvantages associated with both status and on/off-reserve residence are consistent with the relative segregation observed: the lower degrees of nonstatus and off-reserve occupational segregation are accompanied by less inequality

Table 9. Occupational Class Distribution of Natives and Non-Natives, By Sex: Canada, 1971.

Occupational Class[a]	Non-Native	Indian			Inuit
		Total Indian	Status Indian	Nonstatus Indian	
	Male				
1 (Highest)	4%	1%	1%	1%	--[b]
2	12	4	3	5	3
3	10	4	3	4	5
4	21	12	9	14	11
5	23	26	40	27	18
6 (Lowest)	31	53	44	49	63
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Female				
1 (Highest)	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%
2	9	5	5	5	4
3	23	15	15	16	13
4	22	16	17	15	8
5	20	26	26	25	26
6 (Lowest)	23	37	37	38	48
Total[c]	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%

[a]Blishen and McRoberts (1976).

[b]Less than 0.5 percent.

[c]May not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Special tabulation of 1971 Census data.

among nonstatus (-43) than status (-48) Indian males, and off-reserve inequality averages -45 compared to -52 on reserves. Such provincial patterns as may be discerned in the highly variable Native/non-Native inequality indexes for men differ from those observed among the measures of segregation. In Table 10, the inequality indexes for Quebec, New Brunswick and (except off-reserve) Nova Scotia are consistently below the national figures. Depending on the status and residence distinctions being made, the inequality measured in the other provinces and in the territories is usually greater than that found at the national level. The greatest levels of inequality involving Indians are found in Ontario (on-reserve only), Manitoba (off-reserve and status), Saskatchewan (nonstatus) and the Northwest Territories (all Indians). The greatest degree of Native/non-Native inequality to be found by this study is that for Inuit males in Quebec (-83), slightly greater than the national index for Inuit men (-80), and double that for Inuit males in the Northwest Territories (-41).

Despite being more segregated occupationally from non-Natives than are Native men, Native women experience generally less occupational disadvantage--and in a few instances a slight advantage--vis-à-vis non-Native females (Table 11), perhaps reflecting their participation in such professions as teaching, nursing and social work. As found among Indian men, however, and despite the greater

Table 10. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Inequality[a] Between Native and Non-Native Males: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971.

Province	Native Indian					Inuit
	Total Native Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
Canada	-45	-48	-52[b]	-45[b]	-43	-80
N.S.	- 2	-36	-40	-52	--[c]	--[c]
N.B.	-23	- 5	- 8	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]
Que.	-33	-37	-41	-32	-16	-83
Ont.	-50	-58	-68	-46	-31	--[c]
Man.	-55	-59	-52	-60	-49	--[c]
Sask.	-55	-52	-54	-53	-67	--[c]
Alta.	-49	-42	-29	-47	-55	--[c]
B.C.	-47	-50	-55	-40	-42	--[c]
Yukon	-48	-46	NA	NA	--[c]	--[c]
N.W.T.	-58	-57	NA	NA	-55	-41

[a]The indexes represent the extent to which the probability of a Native being in a lower occupational rank than a non-Native exceeds the opposite probability. Standardization eliminates the effect of overall occupational-rank structure on the inequality measured.

[b]Weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable.

[c]Number too small for analysis.

Table 11. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Inequality[a] Between Native and Non-Native Females: Canada, Selected Provinces and the Territories, 1971.

Province	Native Indian					Inuit
	Total Native Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
Canada	-34	-38	-39[b]	-26[b]	-28	-37
N.S.	-32	-20	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]
N.B.	+ 5	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]	--[c]
Que.	- 8	+ 2	-15	- 8	- 7	-38
Ont.	-42	-40	-51	-29	-12	--[c]
Man.	-34	-42	-41	-21	-52	--[c]
Sask.	-50	-49	-69	-41	-73	--[c]
Alta.	0	-19	+ 2	-20	+ 5	--[c]
B.C.	-43	-37	-58	-31	-27	--[c]
Yukon	--[c]	--[c]	NA	NA	--[c]	--[c]
N.W.T.	-48	-38	NA	NA	--[c]	-43

[a]The indexes represent the extent to which the probability of a Native being in a lower occupational rank than a non-Native exceeds the opposite probability. Standardization eliminates the effect of overall occupational-rank structure on the inequality measured.

[b]Weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable.

[c]Number too small for analysis.

segregation of nonstatus, as compared with status, Indian women, the latter are more disadvantaged vis-à-vis non-Native females than the former (-38, as compared to -28). Among women, too, the average occupational disadvantage vis-à-vis non-Natives is less off reserves than on (-26, as compared to -39). Interprovincial variation in Native/non-Native occupational inequality among women exhibits a pattern like that traced among men, in that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec have lower inequality values than observed at the national level, as do British Columbia when controlling for status, Manitoba (off-reserve only) and Ontario (nonstatus only), while the greatest degrees of inequality are found without exception in Saskatchewan. As observed among men, at the national level, the disadvantage to Inuit (-37) is greater than that to (all) Indian women (-34). The level of inequality measured for Inuit women in the Northwest Territories (-43), however, is greater than that found for Inuit men in the Northwest Territories (-41), as well as for Inuit women in the country as a whole (-37) and Quebec (-38).

Like segregation, then, inequality between Native and non-Native Canadians appears to have decreased over the 1960s: the values of -45 and -34 for all Indian men and women, respectively, are lower than the corresponding figures reported for 1961 (-65 and -68) in the Introduction (see p. 10, above). Nevertheless, the inequality indexes for 1971 are very high.

Summary

The major generalizations about occupational segregation and inequality between Native and non-Native Canadians in 1971 may be recapitulated as follows:

1. The occupational segregation of Native Canadians, particularly females, remains high, despite having decreased since 1961.
2. With very few exceptions, the degree of occupational inequality experienced by Native Canadians, especially men, is by any criterion very high, despite declining since 1961.
3. Inuit are more segregated from non-Natives than Indians, and the overall occupational rank of Inuit, relative to non-Natives, particularly among men, is lower than that of Indians.
4. Nonstatus Indians are more highly segregated occupationally than status Indians, but usually not as concentrated into lower ranking jobs.
5. Status Indians living off-reserve generally experience less occupational segregation and inequality than those residing on-reserve.
6. Occupational segregation between Indians and non-Natives tends to be lower in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia than elsewhere.

7. Occupational inequality between Indians and non-Native males tends to be lower in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and (among women) Alberta than in the rest of the country; among women it is highest in Saskatchewan.

4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to acquire and analyze hitherto unreleased Census data on the occupations of Native and non-Native Canadians, making distinctions neglected or impossible in previous research. The results obtained include national and provincial measures of occupational inequality as well as segregation between Natives and non-Natives, distinguishing women from men, Inuit from Indians, status from nonstatus Indians, and on/off-reserve residence. The findings document persistently high levels of Native/non-Native occupational segregation, particularly among females, the Inuit, nonstatus Indians, and status Indians living on their reserves and of Indians generally in the Prairie Provinces. Overall occupational rank tends to be lower for Native males, for the Inuit, for status Indians (especially on reserves), and west of Quebec, excluding Alberta.

Although policy recommendations are beyond the mandate of this study, the results reported here lend themselves to use in making decisions in the areas of development, employment and affirmative action. To the extent that such programs are aimed at Native peoples, the findings of this

study could be used in selecting specific target groups and in assigning regional priorities. In basing decisions on the results reported here, however, it must be remembered that accompanying Native/non-Native occupational segregation and inequality are enormous differentials in unemployment, income and power, such that no category of Natives anywhere in Canada can be ignored in policy formulation or program implementation. Moreover, the full potential of this study will be realized only in conjunction with an equivalent analysis of 1981 Census data (cf. Table 12), updating interdecade trends for use in guiding consultation and in program design.

Table 12. Standardized Indexes of Occupational Segregation and Inequality Between Indians[a] and Non-Native Canadians, By Sex: 1951-1971

	1951	1961	1971	1981
Segregation				
Male	71	65	54	?
Female	80	73	62	?
Inequality				
Male	-81	-65	-45	?
Female	-86	-68	-34	?

[a]Includes Inuit in 1951.

Sources: 1951 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1953: Table 12)
1961 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1964: Table 21)
1971 (Special tabulation of 1971 Census data)
1981 (Scheduled for release in 1983).

REFERENCES

Blishen, Bernard R.

1958 "The construction and use of an occupational class scale." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science 24 (November):519-531.

1967 "A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 4 (February):41-53.

1970 "Social class and opportunity in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 7 (May):110-127.

Blishen, Bernard R., and Hugh A. McRoberts

1976 "A revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 13 (February):71-79.

Canada Employment and Immigration Commission

1981 Labour Market Development in the 1980s. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Canada. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

1972 Schedule of Indian Reserves and Settlements. Ottawa: Information Canada.

1980 Indian Conditions: A Survey. Ottawa: Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Darroch, A. Gordon

1979 "Another look at ethnicity, stratification and social mobility in Canada." Canadian Journal of Sociology 4 (Winter):1-25.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics

1953 Ninth Census of Canada, 1951. Vol. IV. Labour Force: Occupations and Industries. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

1964 1961 Census of Canada, Vol. III, Part I (Bulletin 3.1-15) Labour Force: Occupations by Sex, Showing Birthplace, Period of Immigration and Ethnic Group: Canada and Provinces. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Duncan, Otis Dudley
1952 "Urbanization and retail specialization." Social Forces 30 (March):267-271.

Gibbs, Jack P.
1965 "Occupational differentiation of Negroes and whites in the United States." Social Forces 44 (December): 159-165.

Lanphier, C. Michael
1980 Ethnicity and Occupational Prestige Ranking. Toronto: Institute for Behavioural Research, York University.

McGahan, Peter
1982 Urban Sociology in Canada. Toronto: Butterworths.

Porter, John
1965 The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada
1975 1971 Census of Canada, Vol. III, Part 3 (Bulletin 3.3-7) Occupations by Sex, Showing Birthplace, Period of Immigration, and Ethnic Group, for Canada and Provinces. Ottawa: Information Canada.

1976 1971 Census of Canada, Vol. I, Part 3 (Bulletin 1.3-1) Population: Introduction to Volume I (Part 3). Ottawa: Information Canada.